



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/565,157

01/19/2006

Wittich Kaule

2732-173

7236

6449

7590

01/14/2010

ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.

1425 K STREET, N.W.

SUITE 800

WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

CALLAWAY, JADE R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2872

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/14/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	Application No. 10/565,157	Applicant(s) KAULE ET AL.	
	Examiner JADE R. CALLAWAY	Art Unit 2872	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 16 December 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: _____.
 Claim(s) objected to: _____.
 Claim(s) rejected: 1-5,9-12,39,48,59,62,63 and 76.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
 13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Stephone B. Allen/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2872

/JADE R. CALLAWAY/
Examiner, Art Unit 2872

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments and remarks are noted. However they are not found persuasive. Applicants argue that the prior art cited does not disclose "subareas being free of any diffraction structures" or "the subareas that form a not diffractive contrast image." The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicants point to an embodiment described at col. 6 lines 51-65 to argue that the subareas (10) are not free of diffractive structures or are recognizable substantially only under specific viewing conditions. The Examiner respectfully notes that the previous embodiment as described by lines 10-50 of col. 6, states that the gaps (10) do not include a diffractive structure and are recognizable substantially only under specific viewing conditions. The diffraction structure is included in layer 13. The Examiner also notes that the phrase "free of any diffraction structures" does not specify that any thickness above or below the subarea cannot have a diffraction structure, rather only that the subarea itself (i.e. gaps 10) does not include a diffraction structure. Additionally, Schmitz et al. disclose that the gaps (10) are only visible under transmitted light. The gaps, and the information included therein, remain invisible during other viewing conditions.

Applicants further argue that the prior art cited does not disclose that "the subareas are produced during the embossing process with the embossing die already providing the at least one of the subareas being free of any diffraction structures." The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Schmitz et al. disclose (e.g. col. 6, lines 46-50) that the embossed layer can be formed separately of directly onto the surface of the carrier. The Examiner also noted in Section 5 of the Office Action dated 10/16/09 that claims 1 and 76 are product-by-process claims and that the determination of patentability is based on the product itself. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentably even though the prior product was made by a different process. Additionally Schmitz et al. do tie the conditions under which the diffractive image of layer 13 is reconstructed to the conditions under which the information represented by gaps 10 is visible since gaps 10 are only visible under transmitted light.

/Stephone B. Allen/
SPE, Art Unit 2872